1/14/72

Dear Larry,

Your 1/11 with enclosures (many thanks) didn't get here until this a.m. I haven't time to look at the rest, but the story is great. No apologies and don't owrry about what you may have omitted that Wecht said or that the desk cut. There is no serious error in it and little of that. Many of those considered critics could not have done it as well. I assume your desk had no concern about libel, but believe me, as long as you don't say he went to a diploma mill or left a sponge in a bladder, you can't libel him. More and more of this is accumulating, which is why I've dropped everything to make fast response, even though I don't expect to be able to get this into today's outgoing mail, which would require a special trip to the P.O. now.

If you will remember my first backgrounding on this, in advance of the fact, there is either something I didn't indicate or something you don't recall, and I can't spell it out. However, I can put it this way: others have applied for access than has been indicated in any story to date. (You didn't catch Wecht's point when he said four pathologists alone have applied whereas Graham said four in all, of whom only three are path. The fourth is NYC's Helpern. His application was made about 1968, on his behalf by a former Congressman, Ted Kupferman, now an appeals judge in NYC courts. Marshall, Graham at al are ignoring what they want to ignore, are including only present requests. I was the first and I repeated my requests often. I made my first request about 11/1 or 2/66 and was rejected. I then went to court, remember?) Now there are ways in which a crooked interpretation of the contract could lead to the granting of access to other than a pathologist or serious scholar. Like a fink flack aka reporter. I hope I have been able to forestall this, but if I have not, I think this will soon enough be in court. I have taken all the necessary preliminary steps, I think, insofar as a non-lawyer can have a qualified opinion. You should understand that Archives regulations on what is withheld require that a record be kept of all denials and that when anything is declassified all who have been rejected must have equal access. They will, of course, interpret the comtract as negating this, but it covers somethings that it just cannot so cover. If I go to court I may make a broadside attack on the legality of the entire contract because if covers non-Kennedy property, off the record. No telegraphing.

I have written the judge who sat on my suit for some of this stuff charging perjury and fraud to the Archivist, ccs. to the Archivist and Marshall. No responses.

Now, on Lattimer interview. I've checked for you and your story did not appear in NYC, which will help you. I have had confirmation of some suppicion. He is rabidly anti-red andconsiders this all a deep red plot in which an army of trained guerrilla fighters, of whom Oswald was one, were turned loose to kill everybody off. Really, that wild. At least superficially he is a supersuperpatriot. I think that aside from what we have discussed and what you know for yourself, it would be good to lead him into this, perhaps by a general discussion of what, from all his in-depth investigation\the details of which you should come back, to later, for here was none), he think lies behind so dastardly a deed. If he doesn't take that bait, perhaps ask the opinion did the Warren Commission understate the political implications, Oswald red, etc. And if he still doesn't take the bait, remind him that he has all along said his great and consuming interest in the Lincoln assassination led to his interest in JFK and he has from the first spoken often of the parallels. There can be NO parallel unless that of JFK was a conspiracy. Who besides Oswald? Only his bosses, natch. Get the point? Lead this guy out on such thiggs in as much detail as you can and if possible have a second tape recorder going so you won't have to dub, for it is important that I go over all of this as carefully and as soon as possible. This thing is beginning to assume the proportions of a "Guns of November", if you rmember that novel. After you and he have had this real nice chat and you've gotten all the seemingly innocuous that should be a self-disclosure of a politically sick man with animus and somewhat of an ego, you should ask him how he and the Warren Commission can both be right on the same bullet trajectory if he begins two inches or more higher

than the Com ission, for must it not thereafter have an identical trajectory for the Commission not to be grossly wrong on all Connally's wounds? And must they not have been caused by one and the same bullet, JFK's and Connally's? (By the way, stay entirely away from the head, unless he volunteers. There are many reasons, but this other stuff is now more important, for one valuable part of the record will be his failure to ever say anything about the cause of death, among other things). Wh en he places this entry wound higher, he necessarily places it in the neck, yet it may not have struck bone, for if it did it destroys the Report in many way, one because they swore it didn't, another because that defaces bullet s and this one was perfect, etc. So, from his account, the bullet must have gone through the neck itself, still have come out the left side of the front through the shirt collar and the left-hand side of the tie, and in a not unfriendly way, please, ask him to explain to you how this is possible. Merely make a record. Ask him then about how a bullet going thataway could have gone into Connally's right armpit, again just making a record, not arguing. Please appear to be his pal anxious to help him make a good record, on the basis that what has appeared has been inadequate and in some ways not really comprehensible. Don't forget that Connally at some point held his hat in the hand that got hit (see if he knows which side of the hand was hit first. It was the dorsal, inmedical lingo, not the volar, the top, not the bottom. Kinda casually ask him where the hand was when it was hit and if he has identified the frame of the Zapruder film at which Connally was struck. Oh by the way, you might say if you want to throw him off a bit at some point, how long did you study this film, when and what if any others. You might pretend ignorance and ask him if there are any others.

If he wants to go into the fragments shed by 399, the only thing he has ever written about, again let him say everything he can or will. It is his thing and he is woefully lost in it. He either deliberately ignores known fragmentation or is unaware of it. Here the most important thing to get on record is his statement that he has accounted for all the known fragmentation to you. You will want to understand just how important his work in this area is, he should understand, for you have never seen anything that makes sens to you, so you are asking the oracle. On this, he said on the Long John Show that it is impossible to get back a perfect bullet like 399, which is b ut flattened slightly, by firing it into cotton. Don't tell him, but I have more perfect ones gotten for me by a rank amateur. He may have learned about that by now and change it. But if he hasn't, get a good record on that, and after you do, especially after he says this was flattened abit, ask him how it can be flattened without marking it in other ways, for you have seen published pictures that show not a scratch but perfect land-and-groove marks, and you don't know enough about this kind of thing to understand it. Remember, he presents himself as a firearms expert, the man who has fired thousands of bullets in his monumental research. He has shaved them, squeezed them, etc. If you do not feel it will be too aggressive, drawing upon your ignorance, ask him how this bullet could have smashed Connally's rib and then his wrist and then left a piece in his thigh without getting scratched by all that bone....It would be good to know how much of the testimony he has studied (apparently none), how much of the published medical evidence, how much he had seen of the unpyblished medical evidence in the Archives prior to seeing this new stuff, and what other evidence he has studied, from which you can ask his medical opinion, can the medical evidence be evaluated and conclusions drawn without regard to all the other evidence? Toward the end, you should ask how the pictures and X-rays ~~xxxx~~, in his words to Graham,"'Eliminate ~~completely~~ any doubt completely' about thw Warren Commission's conclusions that Lee Harvey Oswald fored all the shots that struck the President". Before getting to this, get him to repeat what he has already said, and perhaps with the neck would be the good point, that 399 could have missed the President and struck Connally only. Once he says that, unequivocally, he has been or great help. I am flooding Teddy's man with stuff he finds unwelcome, and I'll keep flooding him until his position will be intolerable. My slightest interest now is in publicity. I want fact and the time to put it together and use it correctly....I'll be sending a copy of this so he can have the same suggestions to an old and ear friend, Art Kevin, News Director KHJ Radio, Hollywood, 2 13/ 462-2133, who is also going to try to interview L as soon as he has studio space. Art will not be able to do it until after you should be able to from what he has told me. You might, if you have time, fill Art in. Many thanks, gotta get to other pressing things. HW